

# IS THERE A HELL?

BY

W. R. BRADLAUGH.

Editor of "*The Anti-Infidel*."

---

A REFUTATION OF THE  
INFIDELITY OF THE MODERN PULPIT,

In which the Theories of ARCHDEACON FARRAR,  
H. L. HASTINGS, and the Christadelphians are Analysed and proved to be  
erroneous, pernicious, and unscriptural.

---

PRICE TWOPENCE.

---

London

JOHN SNOW & Co., 2, Ivy Lane, Paternoster Row;

W. R. BRADLAUGH,

Anti-Infidel Tract Depot, 70, King's Cross Road, W.C.

# IS THERE A HELL?

---

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY.

IN consequence of the utterances and writings of Canon Farrar, and others of the same school, there is a form of opinion frequently held, and received with increasing favour in these times, that there is to be another chance given to bad men after this life is over ; or a second, or renewed season of probation, which is expected to result more favourably than the first ; possibly a third, or even a round of trials, that will finally wind up all disaster, and bring the most intractable spirits into a thorough state of obedience and perfected restoration. This hope, however, in no sense can we encourage, because we see no benefit likely to be derived therefrom.

Personally we would have preferred some abler pen to have been employed in the service, but as we have, in vain, looked for some cheap pamphlet, written in a popular style, yet dealing critically with the errors and theories as set forth by Archdeacon Farrar in this country, and H. L. Hastings in the United States, we make no apology for entering the lists. The former contending for probation after death in "Eternal Hope," and the latter the annihilation of the wicked, in his pamphlet entitled, "Pauline Theology."

### INFIDELITY IN THE CHURCH.

The danger of the hour is not from the unbelief outside the Church, but from the unbelief within. The polished Huxleys and Herbert Spencers, and the scoffing Ingersolls and Footes, may even render the cause of Christ some service, if by their clatter and din outside the citadel, they

compact and intensify the zeal of its defenders. It is treason *within* the citadel that does all the mischief. A minister who has loose views about the inspiration of the Bible, concerning the Atonement, and about the retribution of sin, is sure to do loose work. For how can a minister, who is shivering from head to foot with doubts, and whose mind is demoralised with the "destructive criticism" of God's Word, do anything to strengthen his weak brethren, or convince the infidel? The "liberal" preacher, or teacher, who is so liberal as to give away vital truth, betrays his Lord. Possibly such preachers and teachers may *please* infidels, and we believe they do, but do they convert them? Frequently are we compelled to listen to such remarks as the following, coming from the lips of infidels: "Farrar says there is another chance, and Hastings says we shall be annihilated, so we are all right, for if we miss the bliss of Heaven, it is very certain we shall be unconscious of the misery of Hell." But what saith the Scriptures, for to them must the appeal be made?

#### IS THERE A HELL?

This is a question that demands an answer, but as many approach the subject with preconceived ideas, or strong prejudices, for or against the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, it will be desirable to get as clear a view as possible of what is involved in the question it is proposed to answer. Therefore it will be well at the commencement of this subject to clear the ground of some of the difficulties in the way of arriving at a correct apprehension of the truth. Because the mere question, "Is there a Hell?" is settled by an appeal to Scripture. For if we believe in the existence of a Supreme Being, and the bliss of Heaven, then, of necessity, must we believe in the reality of Hell, for the Bible that tells of the one, is equally clear in its declarations concerning the other.

#### MAN A TRIUNE BEING.

In the first place we will draw a distinction between body, soul, and spirit. For while it is not usual to speak in this precise and definite manner, we shall discover as we pro-



ceed, that only by so doing can we obtain a satisfactory answer to the question which now commands our attention.

Turning to the account of man's creation as given in Genesis, we learn that not only was he created in the Divine image and likeness, but God formed him out of the dust of the ground, and then breathed into his nostrils the breath of (*lives\**) life, and man became a living soul (Gen. ii. 7).

Now it is evident upon the most cursory glance at this portion of the Word of God, that something more took place in man's creation than in that of the brute. Here we find God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, but nowhere in the Bible is it stated that He did so in the case of the beasts of the field.

Clearly, then, this act on the part of God points to the communication of something from Himself to man, and therefore something more akin to Himself, than is implied in the act of water or earth simply producing in obedience to His command. And though we may be unable to clearly define what that something is, it is certain that man possesses in his being a link with God Himself, which the beast has not.

#### BODY, SOUL, AND SPIRIT.

Man was thus made up of two independent elements, the corporeal and the spiritual; the soul being, as it were, the uniting medium between body and spirit. But while this is the case, it should be borne in mind that the spirit of man is distinct from the sheath containing it: and because this is often overlooked, much confusion of thought has arisen regarding the destiny of the wicked. If this distinction between soul and spirit be observed, it would appear that the uniting point of the elements of our being in this life is the *soul*, while the ruling power in our resurrection state will be the spirit. This will be seen by a reference to Scripture. The Apostle Paul says: "The

---

\* So the word rendered "life" in the Authorised Version should be translated.

first man, Adam, was made a living *soul*, but the last Adam a quickening *spirit*. And that which is sown a natural body (a SOUL BODY) is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 44, 45).

Tertullian appears to have apprehended this truth very clearly when he said that the flesh is the body of the soul, the soul the body, or dwelling-place, of the spirit. In other words, we might describe the soul as BODY-LIFE, and the spirit as SOUL-LIFE. Thus at the beginning of Scripture,\* we are warned against the popular phraseology of body and soul, which has long sustained the very erroneous belief that man consists of but two parts.

Personally we have no objection to the term, "Immortality of the soul," because by usage the expression is well understood; but as these words have no place in the Bible, and are employed by the teachers of error for the purpose of begging the question, and as they are unscriptural and positively misleading, we do not employ them. But in order that we may in no sense be misunderstood, or misrepresented, we most emphatically assert, and wish distinctly to be understood as affirming, that we believe that the spirit of man survives the death of the body, consciously awaiting the resurrection and final judgment.

#### AN APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE.

While the words, SOUL and SPIRIT, are often used interchangeably and indifferently to denote man's higher nature, an appeal to one or two passages of Scripture will make it clear that they are also positively distinguished. Thus in Hebrews iv. 12, we are told that, "The Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of SOUL and SPIRIT, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the intents and thoughts of the heart." Here the Apostle Paul speaks of the *immaterial* part of man as consisting of two separate elements, SOUL and SPIRIT; while he describes the material part as made up of joints and marrow—organs

---

\* Genesis ii. 7.

of motion and sensation. Hence the Apostle claims for the Word of God, power to separate and take to pieces, as it were, the whole being of man—body, soul, and spirit. This tripartite character of man we treat at length in solving the difficulty—"What is the difference between man and the brute?"\* Another well-known passage is the intercession of Paul in behalf of the Thessalonians: "I pray God, your whole spirit, soul and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. v. 23). This prayer is evidently for the sanctification of the whole man to God, and to emphasise it, the whole man is divided into three constituent parts, and the sanctification of the whole man is interpreted to be the blameless preservation before God of spirit, soul, and body. This tripartite nature of man may be described thus:

1. THE BODY AS SENSE-CONSCIOUSNESS.
2. THE SOUL AS SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS.
3. THE SPIRIT AS GOD-CONSCIOUSNESS.

The body gives us the use of the five senses: the soul is the seat of the affections, right or wrong, of love, hate, lusts, and even the appetites of the body; while the spirit, which is our noblest part, is the seat of the mind, or understanding, which came direct from God, and by which alone we are able to apprehend and worship Him. In Scripture there is neither looseness nor ambiguity of language in proclaiming the attributes or functions of the spirit and the soul, for in every case we find that intelligence and judgment belong to the spirit; the affections, desires, and appetites, to the soul.

It may be well, before proceeding further with the subject, to remove one other difficulty, viz.: What is the *present* condition of those who have departed this life? But to get clear and Scriptural views on this point, it will be necessary to draw a distinction between those who died in the faith before the Resurrection of Christ, and those who have departed this life since.

---

\* *Fifty Answers to Infidel Objections* (price 6d.), p. 66.



## WHERE ARE THE DEAD?

By comparing Luke xvi. 23 and Luke xxiii. 43, with Acts ii. 27, and other portions of Scripture having reference to the state of the dead, it is clear that up to the time of our Lord's resurrection, Hades is represented as being the abode of both the righteous and the wicked alike. By the Jews\* it was understood to be a place divided into two compartments, separated by a great gulf—a paradise, or Abraham's bosom for believers, a place of torment for unbelievers. Thus we get light thrown upon what, to many, has been a source of difficulty, viz.: the good spirit of Samuel saying to the wicked Saul, "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me" (1 Sam. xxviii. 19), which would be merely a Hebrew form of saying, "To-morrow thou and thy sons shall be among the dead."

## A SIGHT OF PARADISE.

But when the Apostle Paul was favoured with a sight of Paradise, it was in "the third heaven;" and he expresses his confidence of his spirit being locally with Christ the moment it was locally absent from the body. Therefore we are led to conclude that, at Christ's resurrection, the spirits of all the departed saints were released from Hades; which, though a place of happiness to *them*, from their consciousness of God's favour, undisturbed communion with one another, and anticipation of future glory, was yet a place of confinement; that they were subsequently taken up with Him to the third heaven, when He ascended up on high, "leading captivity captive;" and that they are there joined by every regenerate spirit that departs this life. If we are right in this view of the case, then it naturally follows that the first great act of redemption was signalled by the deliverance of the spirits of Christ's people from Hades (mark, we say the spirits only); as the accomplishment of the next great act of redemption will be signalled by the deliverance of their bodies—and only their bodies—from the grave.

---

\* Josephus' Discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades at the end of "Wars of the Jews," p. 249. Published by Ward, Lock & Co.

What we mean to imply therefore regarding the present condition of those who have departed this life, whether believers or unbelievers, is this—that the spirits of believers are in a state of conscious bliss and felicity in the presence of the Lord, awaiting the resurrection of their bodies ; the spirits of unbelievers are in Hell, or Hades—hidden world—awaiting, in a state of consciousness, the resurrection of their bodies and final judgment.

#### CONSCIOUSNESS AFTER DEATH.

The question of consciousness after death may now be dealt with, because while many are ready to admit that the soul, or spirit, exists after death, they will not allow that it is conscious. But while death is frequently depicted in the Scriptures under the image of sleep, we know of no solitary instance where the metaphor is applied to the immaterial part of man. In Daniel (xii. 2), the statement—“Many of them which sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” applies manifestly to the body. More expressly still we learn in Matthew (xxvii. 52), that the graves were opened, and many *bodies* of the saints which slept arose.” And again : “David, after he had served his own generation, by the will of God fell asleep, and was gathered to his fathers and *saw corruption*, but He whom God raised again, saw no corruption.” Therefore it is evident that what is here described as falling asleep, is the body ; or, in other words, that which *undergoes corruption*. Thus we have clearly established the fact, that the spirit of man not only survives the death of the body, but that it exists in a state of consciousness.

#### WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE WORD HELL ?

The word, Hell, properly means the hidden, or covered place ; and therefore very often in the Old Testament Scriptures merely means the unseen place, both as regards the believer and the unbeliever alike ; the right meaning being at all times governed by the context. The Hebrew language in dealing with a state so far removed from anything of which we have experience, applies the idea of visible things to that which is spiritual ; which is quite in keeping



with our natural and limited powers of apprehension. It takes that which we are most familiar with, and applies it to that with which we are least acquainted. That which is visible at death is the descent of the body into the grave. Hence the phrase, "His soul was not left in hell."

#### HADES, GEHENNA, AND TARTARUS.

There are three words rendered Hell in the New Testament—Hades, Gehenna, and Tartarus, but in no single instance do they apply to the believer after the resurrection of Christ. Hades proper is the place of punishment where the impenitent abide after death, consciously awaiting the doom to be pronounced upon them at the final judgment after the second resurrection.

Gehenna is that place where God's enemies—the impenitent—will suffer eternal punishment after the final judgment of the wicked.

Tartarus is that place where the fallen angels are awaiting their final doom (see 2 Pet. ii. 4).

#### ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

As words are but signs and symbols by which the mind receives the imprint of language, or the thoughts of one person are communicated to another, it stands to reason, if we would ascertain the true meaning of any word or phrase, we must not only search for the root, or derivation of such word or phrase, but we must also endeavour to ascertain in what sense were the same employed at the time such words were uttered, or the document penned in which they appear. If, therefore, we are in doubt touching the meaning of any word or phrase, to make assurance doubly sure, we consult contemporaneous usage of the same. For to insist upon some new meaning which was unknown when the article, or book, containing it was written, would be a violence to common sense and reason. Because words are given a new and varied meaning by new usage. By their use many words now found in the New Testament were brought out from heathen, or more secular use, and endowed with new and significant thought in religious narrative and discourse. Thus by the employment of words

and phrases with which the people were familiar, did Christ and His disciples seek to enlighten both Jew and Pagan alike, on matters which the employment of other terms would have failed to accomplish. In other words, from that which was known, they were led up to that which, to them, was unknown. Hence it were worse than folly to attempt to settle the meaning of any word, or any question, concerning the future state, without first of all ascertaining what, in the language concerning the state of the dead, was the usage, or meaning, of certain words and phrases at the time they were employed. And therefore, in combating the views of Archdeacon Farrar, H. L. Hastings and others, on the subject of Eternal Punishment, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we charge such not only with begging the question, but also with a wanton neglect of ascertaining the New Testament use of words applied to the nature and duration of the punishment of the ungodly.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### RESTORATIONISM.

#### ARCHDEACON FARRAR'S MISREPRESENTATIONS.

Uncharitableness on the part of Restorationists and Annihilationists towards those of a contrary opinion is such a leading feature in all their utterances and writings, that in accusing Archdeacon Farrar and Mr. H. L. Hastings with want of candour and unfairness, we consider it due to our readers that we should clearly prove such to be the case, lest they should be under the impression that in this controversy we have allowed ourselves to be led into launching forth abuse and misrepresentation in place of sound Scriptural argument.

We shall therefore deal with the case of Archdeacon Farrar first, who, we consider, has, by the extreme bitterness with which he has denounced those who do not agree with him in his theory of Restoration, destroyed whatever

authority his position, and reputation, and scholarship, might have given to his opinions. His statement of the views held by the majority of his brethren in the ministry, regarding eternal punishment, is that, "When these topics fall into the vulgar handling of

HARD AND NARROW BIGOTS,

it is only when they reek like acrid fumes from the poisoned crucible of mean and loveless hearts, that we see all their intolerable ghastliness." But to crown all, Archdeacon Farrar makes what would appear to be the foulest accusation that could be made against the moral character of his ministerial brethren. He declares that "hundreds of our *best* clergymen, I know, hold it (my doctrine) at this day, *but fear to preach it*. The italics are ours. Surely he cannot be fully aware of the nature of the terrible charge he is making? It simply means this—that *hundreds of our best clergymen*, from sinister motives, are wilfully keeping back the truth from the people. Is this a true or a false statement?

CAN ARCHDEACON FARRAR BE TRUSTED?

We think not; for, while pouring his contempt and scorn upon the theologians who quote "isolated texts," and talking vociferously about "taking the Scriptures in their broad outlines," he builds his own theory upon the single obscure reference to Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison, by presenting us with the middle of a sentence with both ends cut off; and he cuts in two the answer of our Lord to the question: "Are there few that be saved?" the whole answer overthrowing the sermon to which he makes it a pretext. Therefore we consider, when Archdeacon Farrar so vehemently protests against the "ignorant tyranny of isolated texts," it is a duty we owe to our readers, and the working-men of this country, for whom we write, to expose this trick, because it is so much easier to influence the multitude by an appeal to feelings than by analytic reasonings.

WHAT DOES ARCHDEACON FARRAR TEACH?

Though not a professed Universalist, it is not wronging



aim to say that he is one in hope. His book is entitled, "Eternal Hope," and his own views are evidently identical with what he calls "the gospel of hope." Let us now look at his position, which we will state in his own words :

"On such a question as this," he says,\* "I care but little for individual authority, and this much at least is proved by the many different theories of wise and holy men—that God has given us no clear and decisive revelation on the final condition of those who have died in sin. It is revealed to us that 'God is love;' and that 'Him to know is life eternal;' and that 'it is not His will that any should perish;' and that 'as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;' but how long even after death, man may continue to resist His will;—how long he may continue in spiritual death, which is alienation from God;—that is one of the secret things which God has not revealed."

"There, then, is the sole answer which I can give to your question, 'What about the lost?' My belief is fixed upon that 'living God,' who we are told is 'the Saviour of all men.' My hope is that the vast majority, at any rate of the lost, may at length be *found*. If any hardened sinner, shamefully loving his sin, and despising the long suffering of his Saviour, *trifle* with the doctrine, it is at his own just and awful peril. But if, on the other hand, there be some among you,—as are there not?—souls, sinful indeed, but not hard in sin; souls failing indeed, yet even amid their failing, who long, and pray, and love, and agonise, and strive to creep ever nearer the light; then I say, have faith in God. There is hope for you;—hope even if death overtake you before the final victory is won;—hope for the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;—hope for the mourners, for they shall be comforted—though you too may have to be purified in that Gehenna of æonian fire beyond the grave."

"We are wretched; therefore—not surely in this short

---

\* "Eternal Hope," p. 86, &c.

world only, but for ever—God will pity us. Punish us? Yes, punish, *because* He pities. ‘God judges that He may teach, He never teaches that He may judge.’ His æonian fire is the fire of love; it is to purify, not to torture; it is to melt, not to burn.”\*

WHICH ARE WE TO BELIEVE, GOD’S TRUTH OR THE  
ARCHDEACON’S FICTION?

We have seen what is Archdeacon Farrar’s hope; and if it were confined to himself we might afford to pass it by, but it is a hope that suits the lovers of pleasure well, though not the *true* hope for those “poor in spirit” whom he professes to address, for God has for them a far sweeter comfort. It is only a hope that just those triflers with a Saviour’s mercy, of whom he speaks, will grasp to hang themselves over that awful abyss of hell, till they prove it, not the fire of love, but the awful and eternal fire of wrath.

First, then, as to these “poor in spirit”—souls longing, praying, agonising, striving ever to creep nearer to the light—is God’s answer to your longing, this, that, after all, the fire of Gehenna may be needed to purify you? No, it is the news of a better purification: “The Blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth from all sin.” What saved a dying thief at the last hour can save still without the aid of “æonian fire.” Archdeacon Farrar’s gospel of hope mis-states the whole case as to man’s condition; but worse, it slights God’s blessed work, and substitutes penal fire for atonement,—wrath for grace.

IS GOD LACKING IN WILL OR IN POWER TO SAVE?

Is man willing to have God’s salvation, and God lacking in will or in power to save him? Never, surely. “Who-soever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” Is salvation a doubtful, laborious process, arrived at by long effort, by prayers, by striving, which may be eked out after death by some supplementary process? Nay, but “being justified by *faith*, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Is hell-fire God’s process of salvation

---

\* “Eternal Hope,” p. 97.

for those who look to Him, or God's wrath upon those who reject His salvation? It is the latter, and not the former. Did Christ tell the "poor in spirit" that theirs was the lake of fire, or the "kingdom of heaven?" Did He tell the mourners they should be "comforted," or tormented? It is clear, therefore, that Archdeacon Farrar's gospel of hope is in reality a gospel of infidelity, as to fundamental truth—as to Christ and grace. For it makes sad those whom God has not made sad, while those only could find encouragement in it who are ignorant of grace, or else those who want comfort to go on in sin as long as they can.

#### ▲ VERY SILLY QUESTION.

Archdeacon Farrar asks the question, "Where would be the popular teaching about Hell if we calmly and deliberately erased from our English Bibles the three words, 'damnation,' 'hell,' and 'everlasting?'" We reply, that even if other words were substituted for those now employed, then the reality of the place and the never-ending duration of the punishment of those who die impenitent, would be just where they were before he should do such a foolish thing as to expunge these words from the Bible. We might as well ask where would have been the law of gravitation if on the 6th of June, 1889, we had leaped from the Eiffel Tower into the grounds of the Paris Exhibition below. The law of gravitation would have remained unchanged, but it would have fared very badly with us, and so it will with Archdeacon Farrar if he wantonly and wickedly adds to or takes away from God's Word. A schoolboy might as well attempt to extinguish the sun with a penny squirt, or a ploughboy to keep winter from changing into spring by a wisp of straw, as the Archdeacon to imagine he can destroy the popular teaching about Hell by blotting out the words, "hell," "damnation," and "everlasting," from God's Bible. Because if other words are substituted, nothing is gained. Man did not make the Bible, and it is impossible for man to control it.

#### IS WISDOM TO DIE WITH ARCHDEACON FARRAR?

In his sermon delivered in Westminster Abbey, in his



peculiar modest way, as though wisdom was to die with him, Archdeacon Farrar said, "I say unhesitatingly—I say, claiming the fullest right to speak with the authority of knowledge—I say, with the calmest and most unflinching sense of responsibility—I say, standing here, in the sight of God and of my Saviour—that not one of these words ought to stand any longer in our English Bibles." This is certainly bold language, but we shall show that there is neither textual truth, nor accurate scholarship, nor reverence to God's Word, nor the humility, nor the sacred fear, either of a true teacher or a learner.

#### HELL, DAMNATION, EVERLASTING.

For when Archdeacon Farrar asserted that it was impossible to arrive at a correct conclusion respecting the meaning of these words without going "to the inspired originals and not to the erroneous translations," he must have been presuming upon the ignorance of his hearers. Because Archdeacon Farrar knows, and the merest tyro in the study of Hebrew and Greek understands, that the translators of the Authorised Version have so correctly given the meaning of those terms, rendered hell, damnation, and everlasting, that no change in our language since that time has in any degree modified the position then taken, and now maintained, regarding the doctrine of Eternal Punishment. But even if it were absolutely necessary to appeal to the inspired originals, would the world be left in a state of mental darkness as touching their meaning? No; for thousands and tens of thousands are still able to read them, and as a result, any working-man may now obtain in his mother tongue the best scholarship of the day, and thus be able to speak with far greater authority respecting the doom of the impenitent than even Archdeacon Farrar himself.

Archdeacon Farrar says the verb, to "damn," in the Greek Testament, is neither more nor less than the verb, to "condemn." But if this be admitted, what then? Does the Archdeacon attempt to enlighten us by explaining the difference between the two words? We have

tried, but we candidly confess that we have failed to discover any real difference between being CONDEMNED to, and being DAMNED to eternal burnings. Does the word condemn affect the burnings, or the duration of them ? Most assuredly not. And one does not require to be a very profound scholar to see that the consequences are the same in both cases.

#### BEGGING THE QUESTION.

Again he says : “ *aionios*, translated everlasting, is simply the word, which in its first sense, means age-long.” But Archdeacon Farrar knows that *aionios* is never in the New Testament, when used in a time sense, less than everlasting. It may be limited by the nature of what it qualifies, as everlasting itself is ; but that does not make the meaning more doubtful in the one case than in the other. Anyhow, the Archdeacon is most illogical in his reasoning, for he would put a time limit to a word governing the condition of the impenitent when time has ceased to be (Rev. x. 6).

According to the best authorities, *aion*, and its adjective form, *aionios*, are used one hundred and ninety-seven times in the New Testament. And it is a remarkable fact, which our readers will do well to seriously consider, that this phrase translated for ever and ever, is affirmed alike and without any qualification whatever of three ideas. These three ideas are—God’s existence ; the punishment of the wicked, and the happiness of the righteous. If the Greek word means age-long for one, then it means age-long for all. This admits all we claim in this discussion, viz., that the eternity of happiness and of misery must be measured by the existence of God, which is from everlasting to everlasting. Dr. Hodges says : “ The Greek-language possesses no more emphatic terms with which to express the idea of endless duration than these. They are used to express the endless duration of God. *Aion* is thus used, 1 Tim. i. 17 ; and as applied to Christ, Rev. i. 18. *Aionios* is thus used, Rom. xvi. 26 ; and as applied to the Holy Ghost, Heb. ix. 14. They are also used to express

the endless duration of the future happiness of the saints. *Aion* is thus used, John vi. 58; 2 Cor. ix. 9. *Aionios* is thus used, Matt. xix. 29; Mark x. 30; John iii. 15; Rom. ii. 7. In Matt. xxv. 46, the very same word is used in a single clause to define at once the duration of the future happiness of the saints and the misery of the lost."

A FOOLISH PARADE OF SCHOLARSHIP.

The foolish parade of scholarship on the part of Archdeacon Farrar as touching the words hell, damnation, and everlasting, would be ludicrous in the extreme were it not for the sad fact that thousands, either unable to investigate this subject for themselves, or unwilling to do so, are being deceived by his sophistry. He says:

"Be it solemnly observed, the Jews, to whom and in whose metaphorical sense the word was used by our blessed Lord, never did, either then or at any other period, attach to that word "*Gehenna*," which He used, that meaning of endless torment which we have been taught to apply to hell. To them, and in their style of speech—and, therefore, on the lips of our blessed Saviour, who addressed it to them, and spoke in terms which they would understand—it meant *not* a material and everlasting fire, but an intermediate, a remedial, a metaphorical, a terminable retribution." "It *never* meant an endless punishment beyond the grave."\*

To this is appended a note in which the Jews as a church are stated never to have held either (1) the finality of the doom passed, or (2) the doctrine of endless torment if once incurred. For this he quotes various authorities, among others as the most distinct utterance of the Talmud, one in which it is said:

"That the just shall rise to bliss; ordinary sinners shall be ultimately redeemed; the hopelessly bad shall be punished for a year, and then annihilated."

Archdeacon Farrar would lay much stress upon a limitation of punishment in *Gehenna* to twelve months, and

---

\* "Eternal Hope." Preface xxxii.



taught in the Talmud, but, unfortunately for him, there are several considerations which totally undermine his argument, and destroy his authority for scholarship and accuracy.

#### WHEN WAS THE TALMUD COMMITTED TO WRITING?

First, the Talmud was not committed to writing until the middle of the sixth century, and hence does not necessarily give Jewish belief in the time of Christ and His Apostles. Second, the limitation of punishment in *Gehenna* to twelve months was for the *Jews* only, or for believing Gentiles in addition, and was merely a *purgatory* for those already having virtue of character. Third, those Jews who believed in this purgatory, believed also in *unending* punishment for the persistently wicked. Fourth, no such belief in purgatory existed among the Jews in Christ's day. Fifth, Jesus used language which forbids such a limited meaning to punishment in purgatory. He speaks of the soul punished in *Gehenna*, and of the unquenchable fire in *Gehenna*, and of the worm there that never dies.

#### ARCHDEACON FARRAR PREFERS THE TALMUD TO SCRIPTURES TO PROVE HIS CASE.

In the New Testament *Gehenna* occurs twelve times, and is invariably rendered "hell;" and it is important to notice that, in all but one instance,\* it is Christ who uses the word. We ask, therefore, whose testimony are we to receive as authoritative. Archdeacon Farrar's or Jesus Christ's? He speaks of it as a place of "fire" and "damnation," in which both "soul and body" will be destroyed, and holds it out as a place of punishment, into which sinners will be cast by God. Regarding His words in the light of the opinions then current about *Hades* and *Gehenna* (as illustrated by the Apocrypha, the Targums, Josephus, and other contemporary writers), it is hard to understand how any competent writer can maintain that Christ did not mean to sanction the opinion that *Gehenna* denoted a place of endless torment.

---

\* James iii. 6.

BUT WHAT ARE ARCHDEACON FARRAR'S CONCLUSIONS.

He says:

"Thus, then, finding neither in Scripture nor anywhere anything to prove that the fate of every man is at death irrevocably determined, I shake off the hideous incubus of atrocious conceptions attached by false theology to final retribution."

What right, we ask, has a minister of the Gospel to use such language? Were it not for the fact, we believe that Archdeacon Farrar, in the plenitude of kindly feeling, has been influenced to take the side of error and wicked men against God, we should deliberately charge him with being a traitor to the truth. But this much we do assert, that he teaches that "the fate of man is not finally and irrevocably sealed at death;"\* therefore, if you die in sin, it will be burned out of you in the *Gehenna* beyond the grave. Analogy, however, is against him, and he knows it. The fire did not bring the dead back to life. The worm ate them, and the fire burned them, but no purified and saved body walked back from the valley of Hinnom to Jerusalem. There is no way out of Hell. It is not a corrective or purifying establishment; it is a place of punishment; it is the prison house of the damned! In bringing to a close our remarks on the theory of Restoration, we would say, if it be true, then we need another Bible; if this theory be true, then the threatenings of the one we have are both vain and misleading; if this theory be true, then Christ uttered positive falsehood, or purposely equivocated; if it be true, then the cross was needlessly erected—but it is not true. Therefore, we would implore Archdeacon Farrar to re-study the whole question, not from the stand-point of a sentimentalist, but from that of a humble believer and true exegete. Remembering that exegesis is not a matter of feeling, but the science of interpretation.

---

\* "Eternal Hope," p. 86.

## CHAPTER III.

## ANNIHILATIONISM.

We now come to the theory of Annihilation, regarding which Archdeacon Farrar says, "I cannot accept the spreading belief in Conditional Immortality,"—namely, that hardened sinners who do not accept Christ shall be finally annihilated. But as Mr. H. L. Hastings with one stroke of his pen, disposes of Archdeacon Farrar's fiction of Restoration, in these words, "If restoration had been true, Paul would have taught it; he did not teach it, therefore it is not true;"\* it becomes absolutely necessary that his own theory too should be submitted to the ordeal of criticism; for

"Who shall decide when doctors disagree."—*Pope*.

## WHAT DOES MR. H. L. HASTINGS TEACH?

It will be readily conceded that when a man writes a book he at once submits the same to public criticism. And therefore that we may faithfully and fairly give expression to his views, we will first of all quote from a work which he has published, entitled, *Pauline Theology*, and then refute what we consider to be the deadly error contained therein. Mr. Hastings says:

"Not one passage in his" (Paul's) "writings, teaches or *hints* that wicked men shall *live* or *exist* for ever *under any circumstances whatever*. This idea, that all men are to exist eternally, is not to be *assumed*, or taken for granted. The question is too important to be disposed of by a guess or opinion. It involves the destiny of the greater portion of our race. Can it be true that Paul believed that every wicked man carried within him *an immortal element*, which must go on expanding throughout the far-reaching ages of eternity, and linking man by a tie that can never be severed, to endless *joy* or endless *agony*,

---

\* "Pauline Theology," p. 33.



and yet in all his Epistles he gives us no hint of the fact? Does this look like the doings of one who kept back nothing that was profitable for his hearers? Does this sound like the teachings of modern preachers, who assure their hearers that they have each of them an immortal soul destined to exist as long as God exists.

"If every wicked man had been destined to eternal existence, Paul would have informed us of the fact; he does not once hint it; therefore *it cannot be true.*"

MR. HASTINGS SAYS PAUL TAUGHT ANNIHILATION.

"Every passage that relates to the destiny of the impenitent, imports their *utter dissolution* or *extermination*.

"An examination of the passages will put this assertion to the proof. Let others do it as I have done it, and they will find an argument for the final destruction of the *ungodly* which honesty cannot evade. EIGHT TIMES he speaks of the wicked as destined to PERISH. DEATH is used to express their destiny SEVEN TIMES. NINE TIMES they are spoken of as being destroyed, *once* as DEVoured *by fire*, and *once* as BURNED. Not one of these words has, in the original or the translation, the meaning of eternal torment.

"Not one of them means any such thing in common conversation, and it is only by a 'theological,' or *false* definition, alike repugnant to the laws of language and common sense, that such an idea can be conveyed by such language. Paul does not tell us that he used these words in a *peculiar* or *theological* sense. No Greek would have supposed so had they heard him; and we are led to conclude, that as Paul would not use words calculated to mislead, therefore we are to take these words in their most obvious and current signification.

"Paul did teach the utter DESTRUCTION, or PERISHING, or DEATH, or EXTERMINATION of ungodly men. He would not have taught it unless it were true; *therefore it is the truth.*"\* (All the capitals and italics are Mr. Hastings.)

---

\* "Pauline Theology," p. 41 and 42.

"PAULINE THEOLOGY."

Again Mr. Hastings says :—

"Paul said, concerning his teaching, that he had kept back nothing that was profitable for his brethren. But we find he has entirely kept back the doctrine of the eternal torture of ungodly men. Now, if Paul believed that, he must have been strangely negligent, or else he must have believed it to be an unprofitable subject. If it is not true, of course it would not be profitable. The conclusion is, that *it is not true*, and in that case it should not be taught, or else, if it is true, it is *unprofitable*, and therefore should be kept back."\* (The italics are Mr. Hastings').

We have read most of the Christadelphian and other publications on the subject of Annihilation, yet we most emphatically declare that we do not know of any book of its size that contains so much pernicious and deadly error, sophistry, dogmatism, and intolerant self-assertion, as the work from which we have just quoted.

ATTRIBUTING TO ST. PAUL VIEWS HE REPUDIATED.

Now the case stands thus, either Mr. Hastings really does know what Paul taught, or he does not. If he does know, then he has stated what is untrue, simply to bend the Scriptures to his own pet theories, and if unacquainted with the teachings of the Apostle, then he is equally blameworthy for dogmatically attributing to Paul views which Scripture clearly proves he repudiated.

We know that after his principal Epistles were written, Paul declared publicly in the Council, when arraigned before Ananias, the High Priest, "I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee."† And again when before King Agrippa, he said, "After the most straitest sect of our religion, I lived a Pharisee."† It is clear, therefore, the Apostle Paul must have been well acquainted with the Pharisaic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and consequently of the endless state of reward and punishment. And the

\* "Pauline Theology," pp. 42, 43.

† Acts xxiii. 6.

† Acts xxvi. 5.

very fact that the Apostle Paul described himself a Pharisee, is alone sufficient to subvert the whole of Mr. Hasting's arguments, and to show that Paul in his frequent use of the terms, "perish," "death," "destroy," and the like, was not conscious of saying, and could not have intended to say anything inconsistent with the doctrine of the endless punishment of the wicked.

#### AIM AND SCOPE OF THE EPISTLES.

Besides it must be borne in mind that the force of the objection drawn from the absence of direct assertion of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and from the want of more frequent allusion to eternal punishment, depends *entirely* upon the reason there is to expect from the circumstances of the case that such assertion and allusion would be made. If the doctrines in question were generally received (which we shall prove to have been the case, and if the writer's attention was occupied with matters of more pressing interest, there would be little or no ground for expecting any reference of the kind. Such was the case with the Apostle Paul. His writings are letters addressed to the several Churches, and therefore their primary import is to the saint, not to the sinner. They are intended to give information to the believer, not so much on the subject of salvation and the destiny of the wicked, as on questions which then agitated the churches; such as justification by faith and the Second Advent.

#### JEWISH BELIEF AT THE TIME OF CHRIST REGARDING THE DESTINY OF THE WICKED.

Now, whatever diversity of opinion there may be regarding the notions of the earlier Jews upon this subject, no such obscurity or doubt hangs over the views that prevailed at the time of Christ. It is susceptible of the most decisive proof that the prevalent belief of the people at that time recognised a future state of rewards and punishments. This proof is found chiefly in profane writers, as they are called, but at the same time briefly and conclusively confirmed in the New Testament.

The most competent of these secular witnesses is the



celebrated historian, Josephus. A native Jew, belonging to the order of the priesthood, who was not only a man of learning, but also specially initiated into the ways of each of the three sects into which the Jewish nation was at that time divided.

These divisions, Josephus informs us, were the Pharisees, the Essenes, and the Sadducees. Of the Pharisees, he informs us, "They also believed that souls have an immortal vigour in them. There will be rewards and punishments according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an *everlasting* prison, but the former shall have power to revive and live again, on account of which doctrines they are able to persuade *the great body of the people*."\* This is certainly conclusive evidence that it was the popular belief of the day. Again, he says, "They—the Pharisees—say that all souls are indestructible; that the souls of good men alone are removed into other bodies:† but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment."‡

Josephus, in speaking of the punishment of the wicked, uses the Greek word *aidios* and not *aionios*. This word signifies *perpetual*, or continuing for ever. Thus we get a clear indication of what was the current opinion regarding the destiny of the wicked at the time the Apostle wrote.

Concerning the second of these Jewish sects, we are informed by Josephus, that the Essenes "Teach the immortality of souls."§ Again, "Their doctrine is this: That bodies are corruptible, and that the matter they are made of is not permanent, but *that the souls are immortal*, and

\* "Antiquities," Book xviii., chap. 1, sec. 3. Ward, Lock & Co.

† "It is generally understood that the removal into other bodies" (strictly another body) here ascribed to the souls of the righteous, simply means the new or spiritual body. Whatever opinion may be held on this point, however, does not in the slightest degree affect the positiveness of Josephus' testimony to the doctrine of immortality and future rewards and punishments.

‡ "Wars of the Jews," ii., 8, 14. Price 1s. Ward, Lock & Co.

§ "Antiquities," Book xvii., chap. 1, sec. 5.

continue for ever. . . . Thus good men are made better in the conduct of their life by the hope they have of reward after their death, and whereby the vehement inclinations of bad men to vice, are restrained by the fear and expectation they are in, that though they should lie concealed in this life, they suffer *deathless* punishment after dissolution."\* Our readers will observe in this passage how distinctly the writer represents the future punishment to consist in *continual suffering*.

The statements of Josephus are made still more distinctly significant by the account he gives of the remaining sect, the Sadducees.

The doctrine of the Sadducees is this: "That souls die with the bodies."† Again, "They take away the belief of immortality."‡

It only remains to ask which of these sects represented the received belief in the time of our Lord and the apostle Paul. Josephus himself informs us that the doctrine of the Sadducees "is received but by a few," who when they become magistrates, addict themselves to the notions of the Pharisees, because the multitude would not otherwise hear them." Thus it is clear, instead of Mr. H. L. Hastings giving us the teaching of Christ and His disciples concerning the destiny of the wicked, he is only attempting to revive the old Sadducean materialism by foisting upon the Apostle Paul a doctrine he never held, and which he expressly repudiated.

#### INFIDEL MANUFACTORIES.

In the *American Christian and Armory* for July 1889, Mr. H. L. Hastings has an article under the above heading, in which he says:

"Infidels abound, how are they produced? there are plenty of them, what is the source of the supply? How is it that so many, brought up where the Gospel is preached, and the Bible is read, sink down into darkness and unbelief?

---

\* "Wars," ii., c. 8, s. 11.      † "Antiquities," xviii., 1, 4.

‡ "Wars," ii., 8, 14.

“Nothing will make a man so suspicious of good money, as to be cheated by having that which is counterfeit palmed off upon him ; so spurious religion brings reproach on that which is true ; and it is possible that some of the infidelity of the present day is manufactured in churches which profess to be Christian.”

Precisely, and as we shall have to expose his sophistry in the employment of such terms regarding the destiny of the wicked as (1) “They shall not live for ever ;” (2) “They shall die ;” (3) “They shall perish ;” (4) “They shall be cut off ;” (5) “They shall be destroyed ;” (6) “They shall be consumed ;” (7) “They shall be burned up root and branch ;” (8) “They shall be as though they had not been,” our readers will have an opportunity of judging whether he has himself been tendering genuine coin, and if they should be of opinion that he has been counterfeiting the King’s currency, they will at once dismiss his theory of annihilation as a dangerous and soul-destroying figment.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE DESTINY OF THE WICKED.

Mr. Hastings has given us a summary as to the “Destiny of the Wicked,” arranged under the following heads.

(1). THEY SHALL NOT LIVE FOR EVER.\*

The texts quoted under this heading are as follows : John v. 39, 40 ; 1 John v. 11, 12 ; John vi. 53 ; John iii. 36 ; and 1 John iii. 15. Take one of these texts by way of example, “He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God HATH NOT LIFE (1 John v. 12). Or, again, John vi. 53 : Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, *ye have* NO LIFE IN YOU.” But, how is it that Mr. Hastings does not perceive that, according to the passages he quotes, taken as he would take them, not only the wicked will have no *future* existence, but *have*

---

\* “Pauline Theology,” p. 81.



*none now?* For that is what his proof texts show, if his system is correct.

What, however, his texts *do* clearly prove is this, that eternal life is not merely eternal existence or immortality, for in Scripture language one may be (to use Paul's expression of the woman that lives in pleasure), 1 Tim v. 6, "dead while living." Now, if there be such a living death even now, as we are thus assured there is, WHY NOT FOR ETERNITY?

### (2). THEY SHALL DIE.\*

Our space will only admit of one text being dealt with out of the long list here given. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death" (Rev. xx. 13, 14.).

It is well to note here that the second death is the lake of fire, a death beginning when death—as ordinarily understood—ends and is no more, and, therefore, is certainly not its continuance or repetition, and consequently in no sense can the threatening of death in this case imply annihilation.

### (3). THEY SHALL PERISH.

One of the texts quoted by Mr. Hastings under this heading is, "He that speaketh lies shall perish," Proverbs xix. 9. But, if this necessarily implies that the wicked are to be annihilated, then it is equally clear that the righteous will be annihilated, too, for the same Hebrew term, "*abad*," is employed to denote the condition of the righteous. "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart," Isa. lvii. 1. "The good man is perished out of the earth," Micah vii. 2.

The absurdity, however, of Mr. Hastings' theory of annihilation is best seen by quoting two texts not to be found in the list given by him, we therefore mention them

---

\* "Pauline Theology," p. 81.

here, "And with all lost things of thy brother's which he hath lost, and thou hast found, shalt thou do likewise," Deut. xxii. 3. "And the asses of Kish, Saul's father were lost. . . And as for thine asses that were lost three days ago, set not thy mind on them ; for they are found," 1 Sam. ix. 3, 20. Here precisely the same Hebrew word "*abad*" rendered "perish" in Proverbs xix. 9, (one of Mr. Hastings' texts) is translated "lost." If therefore in the one case it implies the extinction of the ungodly, it is equally clear in the other it implies the extinction of "lost things" and of the asses of Kish. But this is fatal to Mr. Hastings' theory of annihilation, and is alone sufficient to stamp it with supreme contempt, for here reference is made to objects once extinct, if we are to adopt his view, but which are afterwards "found" and have a veritable existence.

#### (4). THEY SHALL BE CUT OFF.

Under this heading Mr. Hastings has been most infelicitous in his choice of texts. Take, for instance, the following : "For evil doers shall be cut off." . . . "When the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it," Psalm xxxvii. 9, 34. If in these cases the Hebrew term "*karath*," rendered cut off, teaches the annihilation of the wicked, then by parity of reasoning the Messiah must have been annihilated, for we have precisely the same term employed concerning Him. "And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself," Daniel ix. 26. Will Mr. Hastings dare to announce publicly that the Messiah was annihilated, and, if not, why, we ask, does he attempt to wilfully mislead the ordinary English reader by a mere play upon words ?

#### (5). THEY SHALL BE DESTROYED.

Not one of the texts cited by Mr Hastings under this heading means annihilation. And if the Hebrew words and their English equivalent "destroy" employed in the texts given imply annihilation, then in these words, "O, Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thine

help," \* Hosea xiii. 9 ; we have a people who, although they have been annihilated, were yet in a hopeful condition. That must certainly be an odd kind of annihilation, which is still susceptible of relief, and, consequently, the whole thing is made to appear, as in fact it should do, extremely ludicrous.

(6). THEY SHALL BE CONSUMED.

"I will utterly consume all things *from off the land*, saith the Lord. I will consume man and beast ; I will consume the fowls of the heaven, and the fishes of the sea, and the stumbling-blocks with the wicked ; and I will cut off man from the land, saith the Lord," Zeph. i. 2, 3. This, we take, as a specimen, and the very form of expression shows the threatening to be of a temporal character, and in no sense to imply annihilation. Surely Mr. Hastings is aware of the fact that in Scripture imagery a living man may be consumed. Should he be ignorant of this, we will give him a few texts to meditate upon (Gen. xxxi. 40 ; Psalm vi. 7 ; xxxi. 9, 10 ; xxxix. 10 ; lxxiii. 19). These and similar portions expose the utter futility of the endeavour on the part of Mr. Hastings to materialise such expressions into meaning annihilation.

(7). THEY SHALL BE BURNED UP.

Here some nine or ten texts are given as denoting that punishment by fire means annihilation. To which we offer the following replies :—(1.) The positive fact that this figure of speech is frequently used to indicate extreme suffering and resistless vengeance when the *subject continues to exist*, and even to describe himself as burnt and consumed. (2.) The expressions often accompanying which describe, not an extinction, but a long-continued infliction. It is "eternal," "unquenchable," "that never shall be quenched." To evade the force of such language requires the double artifice of maintaining that "eternal," not once, but in all cases where it applies to the punishment of the wicked, shall not only be shorn of the mean-

---

\* A text *not* given by Mr. Hastings.



ing of *endless duration*, but of *all duration* whatever, and signify merely final or irreversible. And it would further be required to prove that the incessant continuance of the flame, which in one solemn passage (Mark ix. 43, 48) is twice repeated,\* should be treated as a superfluous use of words on the part of the Saviour. But the death-blow to annihilation is to be found in the fact that the fire of punishment is definitely described in the New Testament as the agent of conscious, continued anguish, and not of extinction of being. The rich man who "in hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments," said, "I am tormented in this flame!" Even if taken as a parable it is based, like all our Lord's parables, on things actually existing, so that, when He makes allusions to the state in Hades, we are bound to believe in the existence of the things alluded to, just as much as if he had categorically affirmed their existence. In this parable He mentions—(1), a place of happiness, called "Abraham's bosom," in which the righteous exist; (2), a place of misery called "Hades," in which the wicked suffer; and (3), "a great gulf" or "chasm" between the two. Thus it is clear that fire symbolises an irresistible overthrow or punishment of the ungodly by conscious suffering, and does not imply their extinction.

(8). THEY SHALL BE AS THOUGH THEY HAD NOT BEEN.

Here we only quote one text from several given—"They that war against Thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought." Surely Mr. Hastings knows that to be *as nothing*, and *as a thing of nought*, in warring against God, is but the popular expression for utter insignificance, *e.g.*, "All nations are before Him as nothing; and they are counted to Him as less than nothing and vanity" (Isaiah xl. 17). Is that annihilation?

---

\* We say *twice* repeated, but, if we follow the received text, it is *five* times, notwithstanding that Tischendorf omits *three* of these.

## CHAPTER V.

## OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

We now proceed to direct our attention to some of the chief objections urged against the doctrine of Eternal Punishment.

## GOD ONLY HATH IMMORTALITY.

*Objection 1.* Mr. H. L. Hastings says: "Prove that all men have immortality, when Paul says that God only hath it."\*

*Answer.* That God only has immortality, that is, inherently and independently, is indisputably true, but man also possesses it, though not inherently, but derived, which we have already proved.† If Mr. Hastings means to assert that Paul's declaration excludes immortality from all but God, then neither saint nor angel is immortal; and this is clearly to contradict other parts of Scripture, *e.g.*, Luke xx. 36. And if from this declaration of the Apostle Paul Mr Hastings wishes to teach the possibility of *any* of the human race *positively ceasing to be*, then it naturally follows, as a logical outcome of the argument, that all created beings, angels and saints, shall also cease to exist. For if God *only* hath immortality, then the very angels, and believers too must cease to exist. There is no getting out of this dilemma. All, therefore, the apostle affirms is, that immortality is the inherent property of the Deity.

*Objection 2.* Mr. Hastings says: "The words *soul* and *spirit* occur in Hebrew and Greek Scriptures SIXTEEN HUNDRED TIMES; and the words '*immortal soul*,' or '*immortal spirit*,' occur in the Scriptures, in *Hebrew, Greek, or English*, not ONCE." "Pauline Theology," p. 67. (*Italics and capitals are Mr. Hastings'.*)

Mr. Hastings, after having, with great industry and a liberal display of italics and capital letters, large and small, given us the number of times the word soul occurs in the Bible, triumphantly inquires why we never find this

\* "Pauline Theology," p. 66. † ANTI-INFIDEL, June, 1889; also "Fifty Answers to Infidel Objections" (price 6d.), p. 66.

## IS THERE A HELL ?

particular word (for he most ingeniously avoids alluding to other words descriptive of the soul's destiny) coupled with the term "immortal," and the like, in such phrases, as "immortal soul," "never dying soul," and, "undying spirit?"

*Answer.* To the question, Why does not the Bible deal with such phrases as the "immortality of the soul?"—phrases of such frequent occurrence in human compositions; we reply, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was so generally and confidently held by those among whom Christ and His disciples moved and taught, that there was no need or occasion for a direct or explicit affirmation of it. With the exception of the insignificant sect of the Sadducees, the doctrine was held by the entire nation of the Jews—not the conditional immortality of some in the future, but the *present* immortality of *all* souls. Hence with the Jews the case must have been precisely similiar to that of the existence of God. This is never *taught* in the Scriptures. Genesis begins with, "In the beginning God created," thus assuming the doctrine of the existence of the Supreme Being. Why? Because none with whom the inspired writers were directly concerned would question the truth. Not that there were none who denied the being of God. There were in David's time "fools who said in their hearts, There is no God," just as there were in our Lord's time Sadducees who denied, not the *immortality* of the soul, but the existence of such beings as *spirits*. But the number of atheists was so insignificant, that their error was not deemed worthy of notice, as doubtless it would have been had they been as numerous and influential as the polytheists. Hence we find the Scriptures are full of denunciations of the latter, but almost silent as regards the former.

But the silence of Scripture touching the doctrine of the immortality of the soul (so far as these words are concerned) does not arise solely from the fact that it was admitted and might be assumed, but because the inspired writers were charged with messages of such tremendous



import concerning the character, and condition of that endless existence, as to quite throw into the back-ground the abstract proposition of the soul's immortality.

If they had been mere human teachers, very possibly they might have indulged in sentimental dissertations and romantic speculations on the greatness and the immortality of the human soul. But they came as divine teachers, to teach men concerning the present and eternal relations to the government of God ; to proclaim endless holiness and well-being, or everlasting misery and woe, as pending on the faith and repentance of man still here below. To them the naked question of immortality, aside from these relations and issues was of no account at all. They therefore addressed themselves to their divine mission, and told men always of the actual *immortality*, or state of deathlessness before them. They never told men so little as the bald fact that they should merely exist hereafter ; they told them a great deal more : they told them *how* they should exist, *viz.*, either in a state of endless bliss, or endless woe.

Such is the Scripture mode of speech on this subject. It does not discourse on the immortal *being*, or *existence*, of either class of persons, nor does it say that they shall never cease to be, but it speaks of the everlasting life of the one class, the eternal weight of glory ; their glory, honour, incorruptibility, their incorruptible crown, their inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away ; their state in which they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, where there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, nor any more pain. Precisely so, on the other hand, if there is no metaphysical statement concerning the " never dying spirit," or the " eternal *existence* " of the wicked, there are the most positive and awful assertions of their everlasting *punishment*, their never dying worm and unquenchable fire, their never receiving forgiveness in this world, or the world to come, their eternal damnation, the smoke of their torment that ascendeth up for ever, their shame and everlasting contempt, their departure into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, their

being destined to the blackness and darkness for ever, and receiving from God indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, at the day of judgment. It is therefore, in plain language, little better than a quibble for Mr. Hastings to argue that the phrases, "immortal," "never dying," and the like, are not applied to the soul itself, when they are abundantly applied to its destiny and condition. It matters little that the Bible does not know the *phrase*, "immortal soul," when it so manifestly knows the *thing*; and indeed so perfectly in keeping with the whole practical method of God's Word, is its entire absence from all utterance concerning the *mere* "immortality of the soul," that had it been otherwise, very likely Annihilationists would have then been the first to question the genuineness of the passages and would have insinuated that they were of foreign origin, of a philosophic cast, not Jewish, and therefore unscriptural. What the Scriptures really do, is to describe the actual state and condition of both the righteous and the wicked, as they continue in *conscious* joy or woe for evermore.

Mr. Hastings, as a scholar, must know that the true word for immortality (*athanasia*) occurs but three times: 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54—"This mortal must put on *immortality*;" "When . . . this mortal shall put on *immortality*;" and once of God it is asserted (1 Tim. vi. 16) that He only hath *immortality*. The adjective, "immortal," does not appear once (See 1 Tim. i. 17, R.V.).

There is indeed another word, *aphtharsia*, twice translated in the Authorised Version, "immortality," and that is the word which Mr. Hastings has caught at as showing man's seeking for it; but its proper meaning is "incorruption," and so it is mostly translated. We cite all the passages:

Romans ii. 7.—"glory, honour, and *immortality*."

1 Cor. xv. 42.—"it is raised in *incorruption*."

" xv. 50.—"neither doth corruption inherit *incorruption*."

" xv. 53.—"must put on *incorruption*."

" xv. 54.—"shall have put on *incorruption*."

Eph. vi. 24.—“love our Lord Jesus Christ in *sincerity*.”

2 Tim. i. 10.—“brought life and *immortality* to light.”

Titus ii. 7.—“incorruptness, gravity, *sincerity*.”

Its adjective (*aphthartos*) incorruptible, is used seven times, and applied to God (Rom. i. 23; 1 Tim. i. 17); the crown of the righteous (1 Cor. ix. 25); our inheritance (1 Peter i. 4); the Word of God (1 Peter i. 23); and once figuratively, “that which is not corruptible.” It is only once in the Authorised Version (1 Tim. i. 17) rendered “immortal,” but as we have already shown, with no more reason than in other places. Furthermore, its *opposite* (*phthartos*), “corruptible,” is six times found, and always so rendered: Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25; xv. 53, 54; 1 Peter, i. 18, 23.

The difference between these words comes out in 1 Cor. xv., in which they are all to be found. Speaking of the dead body of the saint (verses 42-50) the apostle uses the word “corruptible” and “corruption.” It is not *mortal* but DEAD. Then speaking of the resurrection of those that are Christ’s at His coming (ver. 23), he brings in also the change of the *living* saints which would accompany it: “We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed;” “the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we (the living) shall be changed; for this corruptible (applying to the dead saints) must put on *incorruption*, and this mortal (applying to the living) must put on *immortality*.”

Thus it is clear from Scripture that the word immortality is never applied to man’s spiritual nature, neither in the case of the believer nor the unbeliever. It is always associated with his material body, there being no necessity to apply the word immortal to the soul, or spiritual part of man, because it is of itself immortal. Evidently therefore on the part of Mr. Hastings, while there has been a great cry there has been very little wool, for the words “mortal” and “immortality” are not applied to the soul, but to the body.



WHY SHOULD MAN SEEK FOR IMMORTALITY IF HE  
ALREADY POSSESSES IT ?

*Objection 3.* In Romans ii. 7, we read : " To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour and *immortality*." Is not this decisive that immortality does not belong to man naturally, otherwise why should he be commanded to seek for that which he has already got ?

*Answer.* But it is not quite decisive. The Greek word translated " immortality " is *aphtharsia*, and means incorruption. It is used fifteen times in the New Testament.

In 1 Cor. xv., it is used four times in connection with the resurrection body, and is translated " incorruption ; " hence it has no reference to the immortality of the soul, but to the incorruptibility of the glorified body. And again the same word *aphtharsia* is translated and signifies " sincerity," as in Ephesians vi. 24, and Titus ii. 6.

CAN A GOD OF LOVE CONSIGN ANY OF HIS CREATURES TO  
ETERNAL TORMENT ?

*Objection 4.* Is it possible that a God of love can consign any of His creatures to eternal torment ?

*Answer.* How does any one know that " God is love ? " Entirely from the Bible. This knowledge is not inherent. The same Book which reveals His love, discloses His *justice* too. Justice is a Divine attribute as well as love, and as all Jehovah's attributes are equal, one cannot be magnified at the expense of the other. A God all love is not a God all just. His love pities and would save, but if the sinner continues obdurate, His justice must have satisfaction. The same Book which makes known God's love, makes known His determination to punish the wicked eternally. The doctrine of eternal punishment is entirely a revelation. How can God pass by sin and permit it to go unpunished ? This would be to connive at it. It must be punished, and the sinner must undergo the punishment so long as he remains an unchanged rebel ; and as there is not the slightest warrant or shadow of proof for holding that the punishment of hell will ever effect a transformation, the sinner must

remain eternally unchanged, and so endure eternal punishment.

God has evinced His yearning affection by the earnest and oft-repeated exhortation, "Turn ye, why will ye die?" and by assuring us that, except we repent, we must all perish. But turning from sin is necessary to life, and repentance is a condition of not perishing; if therefore a man refuses to accede to the simple terms of the Divine will, he wilfully excludes himself from the love of God; he deliberately rejects mercy; he pours contempt on Heaven's loving proclamation of pardon; he becomes a rebel; he places himself outside the pale of compassion. Punishment must endure so long as the rebellion lasts, and final impenitence involves endless punishment. Surely none will say that it would be *love* in God to wink at sin, to let the rebel go free, and to receive the unclean soul into glory. Would not that be to encourage iniquity, to forfeit His own justice and truth, and, in a word, to undeify Himself? Moreover, to grant the principle of this objection, would be to declare that there ought to be no punishment whatever, neither here nor hereafter. The objection implies that, because God is love, He cannot punish. Love and punishment are held to be so antagonistic, that they cannot exist together. Then how is it that a loving God visits men in this world with life-long sorrows? And if, as we all well know, the hand is very heavy upon some sinners even in this life, why should we deem it a thing incompatible with His love to visit with penalties the finally impenitent?

Sin is ever to be measured by the greatness of Him against whom it is committed. Its enormity demanded an infinite satisfaction which was rendered in the death of Jesus. If, then, the punishment due to sin were not eternal, why was such a tremendous and costly sacrifice needed? It is conceded that God does and will *reward* men. This is not disputed. But this implies that actions are treated according to their deserts. If, then, God rewards and punishes actions even now, why should He not do likewise hereafter?

If, in this world, those who injure society deserve to be punished by society, surely those who offend against the law of God deserve punishment; and if not punished here must it not be hereafter? To say that their punishment will be annihilation (as Mr. H. L. Hastings does), and so rejection from happiness in heaven, is to assert what is unprovable, to put a premium on sinning, and to give encouragement to the infidel to continue in a life of sin and profligacy.

IS NOT INFINITE PUNISHMENT FOR A FINITE SIN DISPROPORTIONATE?

*Objection 5.* Is not the punishment of the impenitent to all eternity disproportionate, and is it not therefore contrary to the justice of God? Surely to inflict punishment for ever on account of a sin committed during a brief period, would be an injustice; and to insist upon an infinite penalty for a finite sin, and an eternity of woe for the iniquity of a short life on earth, is wholly inequitable?

*Answer.* We cannot measure the nature or character of an offence, nor the punishment to be inflicted, by the time occupied in its commission. For instance, a false signature is appended to an important document. The name has been written by the forger, perhaps in a couple of minutes, but the penalty of the misdeed may be long weary years of penal servitude—even for life. But let the punishment be of limited duration, does society, when the penalty by law determined has ended, receive the convict on his discharge from prison as one upon whose character there is not the *slightest* stain? Though the law has no further claim, do not merchants hesitate in employing a man with such antecedents? Even when the rash act is bitterly repented of, and every effort is put forth on the part of the individual to retrieve the past, and by strict rectitude of conduct, an honest endeavour is made to regain the forfeited position in society, does not the stigma haunt him throughout life? Does not such an one suffer the penalty of his misdeeds until he die? A crime committed in a few minutes, yet nevertheless is it not followed by



punishment as lasting as that man's existence among men ; and if the offence be one of which the criminal never repents, does he not stand morally as guilty of that crime as when he first committed it ?

But according to the objector's law of proportion, the crime would be sufficiently punished by the offender receiving five minutes, or at the most, five days' imprisonment. But does not such a conclusion carry with it its own refutation, for do we not know that an act apparently trifling in itself, may involve the most serious and permanent consequences ? If, therefore, with our limited powers of perception, we are able to discern permanent and lamentable results following an offence against the laws of society, who then may estimate the consequences of that which the piercing eye of God may detect as the fruit of our sin ?

But is there not a little inconsistency on the part of objectors ? If eternal punishment be disproportionate to the offence committed, to be consistent, must they not also admit that eternal happiness is disproportionate to the very limited conformity of man during this life to God's commands ? But if exception be taken to endless penalty as the fruit of wickedness, why is not endless felicity, which is promised as the reward of fidelity to the Master, called in question too by the objector ? Does not such a query conclusively prove that the space of time positively occupied in the commission of any act, good or bad, as the case may be, cannot be the standard of reward or punishment.

Besides, it will be readily conceded that it is not the time occupied in sinning, but the enormity of the sin that has to be taken into account. The character of Him against whom the offence has been committed, has to be considered when contemplating eternal punishment. An assault committed on an ordinary member of society would be punishable with fine or short imprisonment ; but for an attack upon the Sovereign, the penalty would be death. Now if we transfer this principle to the dealings of Infinite

Justice, we shall see that we have risen in revolt against the Majesty of heaven, and that we have "crucified the Son of God afresh," not once merely, but over and over again, and therefore we have rebelled against an Infinite King. Consequently if we die impenitent, we are left to the eternal penalty of our own misdeeds, simply because we heeded not His warnings of what would be the results of our rebellious conduct.

But though eternal as regards duration, there will be different degrees of punishment. Some will be visited by the "many stripes," while others will only receive the "few." There will be the hardened and impenitent, of whom it is said, "they shall receive the greater damnation;" and so terrible will be their doom, that even the Saviour has said, "it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment than for them." The judgment will be on the principles of perfect equity. The Righteous Judge will render to "every man according to his works." A distinction will be made between the ignorant sinner and the wilful Christ-rejector. Punishment will be meted out according to deserts. There will be a variation in the *degree* of punishment, but none whatever as regards *duration*; that will be the same in all cases.

Surely none can object, as regards rewards and punishments, to be everlastingly treated with perfect equity. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" "Hath He said, and will He not do it?"

#### WHAT IS LIFE IN CHRIST ?

*Objection 6.* In 1 John v. 12, are we not assured that, "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son, hath not life?" does it not therefore follow that eternal life is only to be had in Christ, or, in other words, is *only* the portion of those who believe on Him, and must not *immortality* therefore be conditional?

*Answer.* Here there is an evident confusion of terms. *Eternal life* appears to be confounded with *eternal existence*. Life, *i.e.*, eternal life, is the term used to signify all the blessings of salvation which the believer has in Christ.



Colossians iii. 4, illustrates this. Eternal life is that which a man receives when he is "born again," and becomes "a child of God." It is a gift superadded to eternal existence, as the reward of faith. The Greek word *zoe*, means *spiritual* life as well as eternal life.

IF ALL THINGS ARE TO BE RECONCILED, MUST NOT THIS  
INCLUDE HELL AND ITS OCCUPANTS ?

*Objection 7.* Does not the Apostle Paul say that God will "reconcile all things unto Himself, whether things in earth or things in heaven" (Col. i. 20); must not this therefore include those in hell, this place being in the centre of the earth ?

*Answer.* When it is conclusively proved that hell (*gehenna*) is actually situated as stated above, it will be time enough to apply this passage to the lost. But suppose it were true that hell was really situated in the centre of the earth, then it is clear that this text does not in any way refer to such a place. The literal translation of the Greek is not "*in the earth*," but *on*, or "*upon the earth*." Thus is this theory overthrown. Further, there is no mention of hell in the text, which is altogether fatal to Universalism. The reconciliation spoken of is not with things in hell, but with things "*on the earth*," and in heaven; and it takes place when the punishment of the wicked in the lake of fire is commencing. It is not possible then that the wicked can be included in such reconciling. The word "*all*" must be used with qualifications, and to see its extent the context must be inspected. We have examples of its use with limitation; *e.g.*, "*All Jerusalem went out to meet Him.*"

WILL THE WICKED BE ANNIHILATED, OR CEASE TO BE ?

*Objection 8.* We read that the wicked shall be punished with "*everlasting destruction*," but as destruction means annihilation, how can it be reconciled with the doctrine of endless suffering, as that which is annihilated must of necessity cease to be ?

*Answer.* It has yet to be proved that "*destruction*" signifies "*annihilation*," or ceasing to exist. That it does



not, so far as the Scriptural use of the word is concerned, we have abundant examples. The word "destroy" is extensively used in the Old and New Testament; *e.g.* :

"The land was *destroyed* with flies" (Ex. viii. 24).

"Knowest thou not that Egypt is *destroyed*?" (Ex. x. 7).

"The Lord hath *destroyed* me on every side" (Job xix. 10).

"The King of Babylon shall *destroy* this land" (Jer. xxxvi. 29).

"O Israel, thou hast *destroyed* thyself" (Hosea xiii. 9).

"The Son of Man is come to save that which was *lost*" (Matt. xviii. 11).

"The thief cometh not, but to steal, and to kill, and to *destroy*" (John x. 10).

"*Destroy* not him with thy meat for whom Christ died" (Rom. xiv. 15).

"The world that then was *perished*" (2 Pet. iii. 6).

Suppose we were to put the word *annihilate* in place of the word "destroy," and read the above texts accordingly, where would be their sense, or their truth? Yet to such absurdity would we be driven if the words "destroy" and "annihilate" were synonymous.

The objection in this case is self-destructive, for the destruction is termed everlasting. Now if it means annihilation, ceasing to be, how can it be everlasting? It is the height of folly to talk of punishment to last for ever when the object of that punishment has ceased to be. If there remains none to be punished, how can the punishment continue for ever? While it is evident therefore that the word destroy is employed in Scripture in the sense of physical and moral ruin, it is clear that in no one instance does it signify to cease to exist.

WILL THE UNGODLY HEREAFTER BE LIKE THE BEASTS THAT PERISH?

*Objection 9.* Does not the Psalmist (Ps. xlix. 12) speak of the ungodly as being "like the beasts that perish? Is not this proof that they will cease to exist hereafter?

*Answer.* It should be noticed in the first place that it is not said that the wicked perish *as* the beasts, but that they are *like* the beasts, and in their death are like the unreflecting brute, because they vainly imagine that they and their possessions shall continue for ever (ver. 11). Their sinful conduct shows them to be wanting in reason.

#### CAN FIRE HURT AN IMMORTAL SOUL ?

*Objection 10.* When the lake of fire is spoken of as the place "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," must not the language be looked upon as symbolical, since it is impossible for fire to hurt an immortal soul ?

*Answer.* Doubtless "the worm that dieth not" and "the fire that is not quenched" are symbols, but then they are symbols of an awful reality. They picture forth something of a most durable character. Certain it is that they are not figures of speech to symbolise annihilation. They are expressions used to set forth a punishment which shall never abate. They point to its perpetuation. If extinction of being had been intended as the ultimate destiny of the wicked, our Lord would never have used such language as that employed by Him in Mark ix. 44.

#### WHAT IS THE MEANING OF WORTHY OF DEATH ?

*Objection 11.* Since all are doomed to natural death, must not the expression "worthy of death" (Rom. i. 32) point to an end of existence hereafter ?

*Answer.* There is nothing to support such a view of the case. (See Acts xxiii. 29 ; xxvi. 31). The same form of expression is applied to deeds, not to persons, as here. If the word death (*thanatos*) has such a meaning here, it must have the like in similar passages, which would be nonsense : *e.g.*—

"My soul is sorrowful even unto death" (Matt. xxvi. 38).  
 "Ye do shew the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). That Jesus should "taste death for every man" (Heb. ii. 9).

#### ARE SODOM AND GOMORRHA STILL BURNING ?

*Objection 12.* Jude speaks in his epistle (verse 7) of

Sodom and Gomorrha "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire;" are these cities still burning, or is the fire still existing?

*Answer.* No. These cities are held up by the Apostle as a perpetual example of the punishment which God inflicts even here, and as a type of that eternal woe He will inflict hereafter. For this view of the case we have Scriptural authority, as Peter affirms that these cities are thus set forth as an example (2 Pet. ii. 6).

WILL ALL MEN BE PUNISHED IN THE SAME MANNER?

*Objection 13.* Will it not be unjust to punish all in the same manner, eternally, seeing that some are more wicked and consequently far more deserving of punishment than others?

*Answer.* If punishment be deserved, the fact of its being eternal does not in any sense make it unjust. God does not measure sin as man does. One sin committed against an infinitely Holy Being is sufficient to exclude the offender for ever from His presence, and to consign him for ever to the prison-house of woe. One thing, however, appears to be overlooked here, viz., that though the duration of punishment in every case will be the same, some will be visited with the "many stripes," while others will only receive the "few."

CAN BENEFIT ENSUE FROM THE ETERNAL PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED?

*Objection 14.* What benefit can the eternal punishment of the wicked secure?

*Answer.* In eternal punishment there will be a demonstration of the justice of God revealed against all unrighteousness of men. The wisest course, however, is not to attempt to be wise above what is written, but to eschew evil, and follow good, and thus by faith in Christ escape the wrath to come.



## CHAPTER VI.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS.

## A BASELESS AND UNWARRANTABLE ASSERTION.

When the articles contained in these pages originally appeared in the columns of THE ANTI-INFIDEL, we received some very severe strictures for having referred to Mr. H. L. Hastings by name. Could we have avoided this, and at the same time have thoroughly exposed the sophistry of the theory of the annihilationists, gladly would we have done so, but we could not. However, whatever diversity of opinion there may be on this point, we are assured that all will be unanimous in admitting that our course has been a fair, manly and straightforward one, and far less reprehensible than that pursued by Mr. Hastings, who, without the least attempt at proof, charges those who differ from him in opinion with moral dishonesty. He says: "I know there *are* men who hold their faith, not because they believe it to be true, but because 'by this craft' they have their living."\* This is just what we may hear from any infidel platform. We, however, believe it to be a baseless and unwarrantable assertion; but, if true, it certainly would have been far more honest to have given names, it being a debt due to society to expose such dishonourable men, if they really exist,

## IS MR. HASTINGS TRUE TO HIS OWN PROFESSION?

Mr. Hastings thus appeals to his readers: "We say, first, decide from the Bible whether the doctrine of eternal punishment be *true*; and then, if we find that no such thing is taught, reject and oppose it as the most terrific blasphemy—the most audacious and unmitigated libel ever uttered against a 'God of Love.'"

But it is from the Bible we have decided that the doctrine of eternal punishment is true, and therefore we neither blaspheme nor do we libel God in believing and proclaiming such doctrine to be true. Is Mr. Hastings

---

\* "Pauline Theology," p. 65.

himself, however, quite sincere? Has he once in the past few years, during very lengthy visits to this country, in any of his Anti-Infidel lectures, made public reference to this subject? And could any trace of the Annihilation theory be detected in Mr. Hastings' Anti-Infidel publications, except by a critic thoroughly conversant with the error of which he has for many years been a well-known exponent? Yet Mr. Hastings, quoting from Paley, says: "Whatever renders religion more rational, renders it more credible; and he who, by a diligent and faithful examination of the original records, dismisses from the system one article which contradicts the apprehension, the experience or the reasoning of mankind, does more toward recommending the belief, and with the belief, the influence of Christianity, to the understandings and consciences of serious inquirers, and through them to universal reception and authority, than can be effected by a thousand contenders for creeds and ordinances of human establishment." If this be true (and who can deny it?) we urge, in justification of our course, that the doctrine of the eternal torture of wicked men *does "contradict" the "apprehension, the experience and the reasoning of mankind,"* and, God helping us, we will, "by a diligent and faithful examination of the original records," dismiss it *for ever* from the Christian system, thus taking away both the scoff and the stumbling-block of the infidel and the rationalist, and leading *both* to embrace the truth, which, when properly and Scripturally manifested, commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. *Then* we can hope to impress their minds, while it is a notorious fact, that at the present day the preaching of the doctrine of eternal torment excites only contempt among the great majority of intelligent hearers. Thus, then, we labour, *warning every man, and teaching every man, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.*" "Pauline Theology," page 72. (The italics are Mr. Hastings').

Now as Mr. Hastings has attributed unworthy motives to those holding contrary views to himself in affirming

that "there are men who hold their faith, not because they believe it to be true, but because by this craft they have their living;" it is only fair that his own *bona fides* should be tested. And we ask the plain unvarnished question, what becomes of Mr. Hastings' solemn asseveration, "God helping us we will, by a diligent and faithful examination of the original records, dismiss it" (the doctrine of eternal punishment) "for ever from the Christian system?" Either Mr. Hastings must confess that for some years past he has not been helped of God in the work in which he has been engaged, or else that his solemn asseveration is of as little worth, as the arguments he brings forward in support of the theory of Annihilationism.

WE WRITE WITH WARMTH.

This we admit, but why do we do so? Not because we desire to hit back again in criticising Mr. Hastings for wantonly attributing unworthy motives to those holding contrary views to his own (though that of itself would be sufficient), but because we believe we are in quite as good a position as he is to speak, if not in a better one, as to what are really stumbling-blocks with infidels. And as the result of a somewhat lengthy and certainly a varied experience, we can most emphatically declare that in no solitary instance have we come across a case where any person has alleged the doctrine of Eternal Punishment as the cause of inability to accept the Bible as a divinely inspired book. But what we very frequently have found has been this, that the theories of the Annihilationists have caused many to drift into infidelity, and that while advocating the principles of secularism, or in the transition state from Atheism to Christianity, the very arguments furnished them by Mr. Hastings have been employed by sceptics in debating with Christians on the immortality of the soul. We, therefore, unhesitatingly affirm that much of the Scepticism of the age is due to the fact that many writers and speakers like Mr. Hastings, while professing earnestly to "contend for the faith once delivered unto the



saints," are positively supplying the infidel besieging party with material of war to storm the citadel of truth, who, but for such assistance, would positively be without ammunition. The Paine battery being captured, and the Age of Reason magazine long since blown up, Sceptics will respect the man who is prepared to take his stand on the Bible as a Divinely inspired book from the first chapter of Genesis to the twenty-second chapter of Revelation, but the man who tries to please them by toning down the Scriptures so as to accommodate them to suit the requirements of a morbid nineteenth century sentimentalism, will meet with the supreme contempt he so richly merits.

In closing we would say that we make no pretension to classical scholarship or high culture, we simply write for the benefit of our fellow-working men, who have neither the time nor the facilities for investigating this subject for themselves. Our only aim and object being to put the truth before them, on the subject of Eternal Punishment, in a concise and intelligent form, in order that they may be enabled to distinguish between the truth of God as revealed in the Bible, and man's perversion of the Scriptures; believing as we do, that at the present time many are being driven into the ranks of Infidelity by what we consider to be the deadly, pernicious, unscriptural, and soul-destroying theory of "Conditional Immortality."

Therefore, in the name of Him who has said, "Thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces, for I am with thee to deliver thee, SAITH THE LORD;" we have drawn the Sword of Truth, which cannot be sheathed until this error be exposed and the King's enemies vanquished. Knowing as we do from a long experience in Christian work that the theory of Annihilationism is doing more to make Infidels, both inside and outside the Churches than all the atheistic lecturers and writers put together.